

Argument against Proposition 51

Bonds are debts that must be repaid with interest, over time.

Since 1998, California voters have approved \$35 billion in state school construction bonds. All were placed on the ballot by the Legislature and backed by the Governor.

Proposition 51 is different. The Legislature did not put Proposition 51 on the ballot. And the Governor opposes it.

We join the Governor in opposition because Proposition 51 is:

UNAFFORDABLE:

Californians already pay \$2 billion each year on state school bonds. Proposition 51 would cost an additional \$500 million each year – money the state doesn't have.

In total, California has over \$400 billion in debt and financial commitments. Governor Brown calls this a “wall of debt.” Borrowing more money we can’t afford is reckless.

UNACCOUNTABLE:

With local school bonds, communities control spending. With state school bonds, bureaucrats and their cronies call the shots. *Local control is the best way to minimize government waste.*

UNNECESSARY:

For school construction, *local bond measures work better than statewide bonds*. Last June voters approved over 90% of local school bonds on the ballot, providing over \$5.5 billion for school construction.

Argument against Proposition 51

School enrollment is expected to decline over the next 10 years. Proposition 51 wastes money favoring construction of new schools over remodeling existing schools.

INEQUITABLE:

Proposition 51 funding would go to those first in line. Large wealthy districts would receive the “lion’s share” because they have dedicated staff to fill out paperwork. This shuts out smaller, poorer districts that need help most. This is *morally wrong*.

REFORM FIRST:

Proposition 51 does nothing to change the bureaucratic, one-size-fits-none state bond program. Small, needy school districts can’t afford expensive consultants used by the big, wealthy schools. Program reforms are needed so disadvantaged districts get the money they deserve.

Last February Governor Brown told the Los Angeles Times, *“I am against the developers’ \$9-billion bond... [it] squanders money that would be far better spent in low-income communities.”*

Brown also said benefit promises to state employees are *“liabilities so massive that it is tempting to ignore them... We can’t possibly pay them off in a year or two or even 10. Yet, it is our moral obligation to do so — particularly before we make new commitments.”*

We agree.

Proposition 51 is supported by businesses and politicians who benefit from more state spending. Yes on 51 has already raised over \$6 million from those who would profit

Argument against Proposition 51

most, including the *Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH)* and *California Building Industry Association*.

California Taxpayers Action Network is an all-volunteer, non-partisan, non-profit that promotes fiscal responsibility and transparency in local government. We combat government secrecy, waste and corruption and seek to ensure everyone receives good value for their tax dollars.

We're people just like you who support quality schools and want fiscal responsibility in government without waste.

Join us in voting NO on Proposition 51.

www.caltan.org

G. Rick Marshall
Chief Financial Officer
California Taxpayers Action Network

Wendy M. Lack
Director
California Taxpayers Action Network

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**